



Chief Minister's Solar Powered Green House Scheme: A Study from Nangavalli Block in Salem District

OPEN ACCESS

Manuscript ID:
ECO-2022-10045141

Volume: 10

Issue: 4

Month: September

Year: 2022

P-ISSN: 2319-961X

E-ISSN: 2582-0192

Received: 10.07.2022

Accepted: 15.08.2022

Published: 01.09.2022

Citation:

Rajasekaran, N. "Chief Minister's Solar Powered Green House Scheme: A Study from Nangavalli Block in Salem District." *Shanlax International Journal of Economics*, vol. 10, no. 4, 2022, pp. 23–27.

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.34293/economics.v10i4.5141>



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License

N. Rajasekaran

Guest Lecturer, Department of Economics

Government Arts and Science College, Salem, Tamil Nadu, India

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2312-5554>

Abstract

Government of Tamil Nadu launches a large number of development programmes to endorse poverty reduction in rural areas. The census 2011 covered 9.56 million houses were in rural areas. There were 23.6 percent of the households was thatch. In this manner, the state government initiates to construct the concrete houses for the rural poor and notably environmentally protect the houses namely "Chief Minister's Solar Powered Green House Scheme (CMSPGHS)". It was started in 2011, to construct the houses measuring about 300 square feet at a unit cost of Rs. 1.80 lakh and CMSPGHS was fully funded by the state government. Each house consists of living rooms like bed room, kitchen, toilet and verandah apart from rain water harvesting provision. Then each house is provided with 5 solar powered Compact Fluorescent Lamps (CFL) for each rooms and Rs. 30,000 for those solar powered lights. Therefore, this study focuses on CMSPGHS in Nangavalli Block, Salem district. In this present study includes an introduction, review of related studies, objective, methodology, CMSPGHS, major results, general observation and conclusion.

Keywords: CMSPGHS, Solar Power, Housing Scheme, Rural Development Scheme, State Government Scheme, Green House etc.

Introduction

Government of Tamil Nadu launches a large number of development programmes to endorse poverty reduction in rural areas. Generally, house is essential for well-being and social security in rural area poor people. Compared to urban areas, the rural areas needed to improve their various development facilities including houses. Therefore, it is an essential need for every human being to reside safely and also need to protect environment (Rajasekaran, 2016). The census 2011 covered 9.56 million houses were in rural areas. There were 23.6 percent of the households was thatch. In this manner, the state government initiates to construct the concrete houses for the rural poor and notably environmentally protect the houses namely "Chief Minister's Solar Powered Green House Scheme (CMSPGHS)". It was started in 01-04-2011, to construct the houses measuring about 300 square feet at a unit cost of Rs. 1.80 lakh, in 2013, the unit cost was increased Rs. 2.10 lakh and it was fully funded by the state government of Tamil Nadu.

Each house consists of living rooms like bed room, kitchen, toilet and verandah apart from Rain Water Harvesting provision. Then each house is provided with 5 solar powered Compact Fluorescent Lamps (CFL) for each rooms and Rs. 30,000 for those solar powered lights. Each beneficiary is given the option to have an electric connection powered by Tamil Nadu Electricity Board (TNEB), which will be metered. Out of the total allocation of 20,000 houses in a year, 29 percent are allotted to Scheduled Caste (SC) community i.e, 5,800 houses, 1 percent is allotted to Scheduled

Tribes (ST) community i.e, 200 houses and the remaining 70 percent are allotted to others like 14,000 houses. Therefore, 4 percent of the District wise allocation should be exclusively reserved for differently abled persons (Government of Tamil Nadu, 2018, 2019 and 2020).

Review of Earlier Studies

Jasmine and Chandrika (2021) focused that the level of awareness of beneficiaries under CMSPGHS in the sample districts. This study concluded that beneficiaries were aware of the scheme, purpose, area of house construction, design of house and amount sanctioning limit for construction.

Sneha and Vezhaventhan (2018) highlighted that poverty is a major issue that we all know. This issue cannot be cleared by the practicing of some individuals. There should be a massive participation in the eradication of this kind of issue. Though there were many schemes and ideas developed to eradicate poverty, still there is an availability of poverty in most of the districts in the state. CMSPGHS has been implemented in almost all the districts with the allotted funds. But the continuation of the proper functioning of the scheme and the usage of the subsidies provided for the below poverty lined individuals is a big question.

Iyer (2015) stated that non-completion and poor quality of the houses constructed under the State and Central Government social welfare schemes viz., CMSPGHS and Indira Awaas Yojana (IAY). Many homes lay incomplete and many others require the beneficiary to suffer a heavy cost of maintenance. Rajendran and Rajasekaran (2015) observed that there is no any debut about CMSPGHS was to support rural poor in a sample Gram Panchayats (GPs) and also there must be needed to properly implement at grassroots level to reach all the beneficiaries.

Rajamohan and Jebadurai (2015) pointed out that CMSPGHS scheme was essential for the development of rural and the below poverty people housing needs but in the implementation process need utmost care for the successful achievement of this schemes.

Ramakrishnan (2013) highlighted that Pudukottai district, there are 1,030 such “solar powerless” houses out of a total of 2,056 houses. All over the

State, there are about 16,400 houses, built under the scheme, without solar home lighting systems. A majority of such houses without the promised solar power are in northern districts such as Vellore and Villupuram.

Objective of the Study

Against this backdrop the present study has been taken up with an objective to study on the Chief Minister’s Solar Powered Green House Scheme in sample beneficiaries.

Methodology

This study was based on primary and secondary sources. The primary source was purposefully collected 35 sample beneficiaries out of 683 beneficiaries from 2011-2012 to 2020-2021 (see for details Appendix, Table - 1) from nine villages for in debt analysis. Cross sectional data was collected at field level from March 2022 to April 2022. Interview schedule was used to collect a data from the samples. Simple statistical tools were used like percentages, rank and Composite Rank Index (CRI). Secondary sources collected from Rural Development and Panchayat Raj Department report, Nangavalli Block official report and web sources for the periods from 2011-2012 to 2020-2021.

CMSPGHS in Nangavalli Block

Nangavalli block is a revenue block in the Salem districts of Tamil Nadu. It has a total of 9 GPs namely Surapalli, Karikkapatti, Chinnasoragai, Gonur, Veerakkal, Sanarpatti, Thoramangalam, Periyasoragai and Avadathur. And the total population of (77,476), male (41,310), female (36,166), total SC (65,55), SC male (34,61), SC female (3,094), total ST (12), ST male (8), ST female (4), total Other Backward Class (OBC) (84,172), OBC male (52,114) and OBC female (32058) (Census, 2011).

In 2011, the CMSPGHS was implemented in Nangavalli Block. Constructed the houses from 2011 – 2012 to 2020-2021, there were 683 works completed and Rs. 1288.50 lakhs amount was allocated and fully spent under CMSPGHS (see for details Appendix, Table – 1 and Table - 2).

Result and Major Observations

This section was discussed about type of benefited under CMSPGHS, reasons for not benefited under CMSPGHS and overall level of CMSPGHS. The following table -1 discussed the type of benefited under CMSPGHS.

Table 1 Type of Benefited under CMSPGHS

Rank	Nangavalli Block				
	1	2	3	4	CRI
Increase social status	18	5	-	-	28
Own house	4	18	1	-	43
Pucca house	-	-	20	3	72
Others*	-	-	-	23	92

Note:

1. Others* - safe house, convenient (5 rooms), solar powered
2. 1,2,3,4,5 – Rank Order
3. CRI – Composite Rank Index
4. There are 23 sample respondents feel benefited under CMSPGHS.

Sample beneficiaries observed that of CRI, 28 recorded the first rank to increase social status under CMSPGHS. Of CRI, 43 sample beneficiaries have said that have own house. Thirdly, CRI 72 shows that sample beneficiaries were pucca house and lastly sample households were preferred others at CRI 92. Notably, in the field level observation these beneficiaries were closely related to representatives like same community, associated with same political party, relation of representatives and another reasons they were ready to give bribe. The coming table – 2 highlighted that reasons for not benefited under CMSPGHS.

Table 2 Reasons for Not Benefited under CMSPGHS

Rank	Nangavalli Block				
	1	2	3	4	CRI
Bribe	12	-	-	-	12
Increase credit	-	12	-	-	24
Rise in Price	-	-	12	-	36
Others*	-	-	-	12	48

Note:

1. Others* - shortage of cement, increased fund, poor quality of solar powered lights
2. 1,2,3,4,5 – Rank Order
3. CRI – Composite Rank Index
4. There are 12 sample respondents feel not any benefited under CMSPGHS.

In the study area, the bribe was a major problem faced by the sample beneficiaries feel that reasons for not benefited under CMSPGHS like CRI 12 because of without giving money (bribe) the representatives were delay to select the beneficiaries, delay to give the cheque, deny the supply of cement, delay to solar power lights etc., for those who are not ready to give bribe for the president. Increase credit was given second reason for not benefited of the sample households at CRI 24. Thirdly the sample beneficiaries express that rise in price at CRI 36. Notably, after COVID-19 price rises was not a particular issues in economics and also in general issues, that same situation was reflect in the study area. Finally, sample beneficiaries displayed 48 CRI. The next table – 3 demonstrated that overall performance of CMSPGHS.

Table 3 Overall Performance of CMSPGHS (in percentages)

SI No.	Variables	Good	Moderate	Poor	Not Available
1	Representatives Approach	20	20	60	-
2	Officers Approach	-	40	60	-
3	Rooms*	20	60	20	-
4	Solar Powered CFL**	-	20	60	20
5	Cement	-	-	60	40
6	Steel	-	20	60	20
7	Door and Windows	-	40	60	-
8	Rain Water Harvesting	20	80	-	-

Note: *Rooms-living room, bed room, kitchen room, verandah and toilet.

**CFL - Compact Fluorescent Lamps

From the above table, majority of 80 percent of the sample beneficiaries were stated Rain Water Harvesting was moderate and 60 percent of the sample beneficiaries were expressed panchayat representatives approach was poor because they want bribe, importance gave to community and political party. The same situation continued from officer's approach (60 percent), solar powered CFL (60 percent), cement (60 percent), steel (60 percent) and door and windows (60 percent). Positively 60 percent of the sample beneficiaries feel that rooms were moderate.

Conclusion

From the analysis, it was clearly observed who were closely related to representatives like same community, associated with same political party, relation of representatives and another reasons they were ready to give bribe so; they were easily benefited under CMSPGHS. At the same time, who were not interest to giving the money (bribe) they were faced many problems by the representatives like delay to select the beneficiaries, delay to give the cheque, deny the supply of cement, delay to solar power lights etc. If remove that above all barriers, there is no any debut about CMSPGHS was to support rural poor in a sample villages and also however must be needed to properly implement at grassroots level to reach all the beneficiaries. Importantly, Government and Voluntary organizations is one of the important roles to cut down the dependency syndrome, which can only be done by increasing the quantum of people's participation at grassroots level (Sharma, 2003).

References

Census. *Total Population and Population of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes for Village Panchayats and Panchayat Unions, Salem District*. Directorate of Census Operations, 2011.

Iyer, R. Swathy. "Poondi's 'Slender' Population

Ignored: The Word Covering Deprivation." *Journal of the Asian College of Journalism*, 2015.

- Jasmine, Naveena C., and M. Chandirika. "A Study on the Awareness of State Government Schemes with Special References to Chief Minister's Solar Powered Green House Scheme (CMSPGHS) in Tirupur District." *Zeichen Journal*, vol. 7, 2021, pp. 125-31.
- Policy Note 2018-2019*. Rural Development and Panchayat Raj Department, Government of Tamil Nadu, 2018.
- Policy Note 2019-2020*. Rural Development and Panchayat Raj Department, Government of Tamil Nadu, 2019.
- Policy Note 2020-2021*. Rural Development and Panchayat Raj Department, Government of Tamil Nadu, 2020.
- Rajamohan, S., and Joel Jebadurai. "Emerging Trends in Green Building – A Study with Special Reference to Chief Minister Solar Powered Green House Scheme in Tamilnadu." *International Journal of Research in Economics and Social Sciences*, vol. 5, no. 3, 2015.
- Rajasekaran, N. *Study of Panchayat Raj Institutions and Rural Development in Tamilnadu*. Periyar University, 2016.
- Rajendran, S., and N. Rajasekaran. "Study on Chief Minister Solar Powered Green House Scheme in Salem District." *Peninsular Economist*, vol. 36, no. 1, 2015.
- Ramakrishnan, T. "These Houses are yet to become Solar-powered." *The Hindu*, 2013.
- Sharma, Rachana. *An Evaluation of Rural Public Housing Programs in India: A Qualitative Case-Study of Problems of Beneficiaries in UP State*. Victoria University, 2003.
- Sneha, J., and D. Vezhaventhan. "A Study on Poverty with Reference to Chief Minister's Solar Powered Green house Scheme in Tamilnadu." *International Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics*, vol. 120, 2018, pp. 123-44.

Author Details

Dr. N. Rajasekaran, Guest Lecturer, Department of Economics, Government Arts and Science College, Mettur, Salem, Tamil Nadu, India, **Email ID:** neelarajan1986@gmail.com

Appendix

Table 1 Number of Beneficiaries under the CMSPGHS in Nangavalli Block 2011-2012 to 2020-2021 (in numbers)

Years	Surapalli	Karikkapatti	Chinnasoragai	Gonur	Veerakkal	Sanarpatti	Thoramangalam	Periyasoragai	Avadathur	Total
2011-12	12 (12)	6 (15)	8 (20)	22 (14)	8 (20)	8 (12)	6 (13)	20 (19)	12 (14)	102 (15)
2012-13	23 (22)	5 (14)	5 (13)	33 (21)	6 (15)	13 (19)	9 (19)	18 (17)	18 (21)	130 (19)
2013-14	21 (20)	12 (32)	12 (30)	22 (14)	8 (20)	9 (13)	7 (15)	18 (17)	21 (24)	130 (19)
2014-15	20 (19)	5 (14)	5 (13)	27 (17)	7 (18)	11 (16)	9 (19)	23 (22)	17 (20)	124 (18)
2015-16	18 (17)	5 (14)	4 (10)	25 (16)	7 (18)	11 (16)	8 (17)	15 (15)	11 (13)	104 (15)
2016-17	2 (2)	2 (5)	-NA-	9 (6)	1 (3)	4 (6)	2 (4)	1 (1)	2 (2)	23 (3)
2017-18	2 (2)	1 (3)	3 (8)	8 (5)	1 (3)	3 (4)	2 (4)	3 (3)	2 (2)	25 (4)
2018-19	2 (2)	1 (3)	1 (3)	3 (2)	1 (3)	5 (7)	2 (4)	1 (1)	2 (2)	18 (3)
2019-20	2 (2)	-NA-	1 (3)	7 (4)	1 (3)	1 (1)	2 (4)	3 (3)	1 (1)	18 (3)
2020-21	2 (2)	-NA-	1 (3)	3 (2)	-NA-	2 (3)	-NA-	1 (1)	-NA-	9 (1)
Total	104 (100)	37 (100)	40 (100)	159 (100)	40 (100)	67 (100)	47 (100)	103 (100)	86 (100)	683 (100)

Source: Nangavalli Block Office, Salem District.

Note: 1. Parentheses indicates percentages; 2. NA-Not Available; 3. Construction Works were fully Completed under CMSPGHS

Table 2 Fund Allocation for Beneficiaries under the CMSPGHS in Nangavalli Block 2011-2012 to 2020-2021 (Rupees in lakh)

Years	Surapalli	Karikkapatti	Chinnasoragai	Gonur	Veerakkal	Sanarpatti	Thoramangalam	Periyasoragai	Avadathur	Total
2011-12	21.60 (11)	10.80 (16)	14.40 (19)	39.60 (13)	14.40 (19)	14.40 (11)	10.80 (12)	36.00 (19)	21.60 (13)	183.60 (14)
2012-13	41.40 (21)	9.00 (13)	9.00 (12)	59.40 (20)	10.80 (14)	23.40 (18)	16.20 (18)	32.40 (17)	32.40 (20)	234.00 (18)
2013-14	37.80 (19)	21.60 (31)	21.60 (29)	39.60 (13)	14.40 (19)	16.20 (13)	12.60 (14)	32.40 (17)	37.80 (24)	234.00 (18)
2014-15	36.00 (18)	9.00 (13)	9.00 (12)	48.60 (16)	12.60 (17)	19.80 (15)	16.20 (18)	41.40 (21)	30.60 (19)	223.20 (17)
2015-16	37.80 (19)	10.50 (15)	8.40 (11)	52.50 (17)	14.70 (20)	23.10 (18)	16.80 (19)	31.50 (16)	23.10 (14)	218.40 (17)
2016-17	4.20 (2)	4.20 (6)	-NA-	18.90 (6)	2.10 (3)	8.40 (7)	4.20 (5)	2.10 (1)	4.20 (3)	48.30 (4)
2017-18	4.20 (2)	2.10 (3)	6.30 (8)	16.80 (6)	2.10 (3)	6.30 (5)	4.20 (5)	6.30 (3)	4.20 (3)	52.50 (4)
2018-19	4.20 (2)	2.10 (3)	2.10 (3)	6.30 (2)	2.10 (3)	10.50 (8)	4.20 (5)	2.10 (1)	4.20 (3)	37.80 (3)
2019-20	4.20 (2)	-NA-	2.10 (3)	14.70 (5)	2.10(3)	2.10 (2)	4.20 (5)	6.30 (3)	2.10 (1)	37.80 (3)
2020-21	4.20 (2)	-NA-	2.10 (3)	6.30 (2)	-NA-	4.20 (3)	-NA-	2.10 (1)	-NA-	18.90 (1)
Total	195.60 (100)	69.30 (100)	75.00 (100)	302.70 (100)	75.30 (100)	128.40 (100)	89.40 (100)	192.60 (100)	160.20 (100)	1288.50 (100)

Source: Nangavalli Block Office, Salem District.

Note: 1. Parentheses indicates percentages; 2. NA-Not Available; 3. Funds were fully allocated and utilized under CMSPGHS